

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-18 remain in the subject application.

Claim 1-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Bloomfield (US Patent No. 6,023,345) in view of Joffe et al. (US Patent No. 6,600,750). Claims 1-18 are believed to be patentable over Bloomfield in view of Joffe et al. as neither Bloomfield nor Joffe et al. suggest or hint at "... upon failure to successfully transmit all of the pages of the fax document to the recipient fax machine, transmitting failed fax pages, defined by those ..., in the ofrm of a secondary email message comprising secondary email packets, ..." It is therefore believed that all independent claims are patentable over Bloomfield in view of Joffe et al and all claims depending therefrom are necessarily patentable over Bloomfield in view of Joffe et al. It is further believed that the combination of Bloomfield and Joffe et al. as the basis for rejection is unfounded, as neither reference suggests or hints at the teachings of the other. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-18 is hereby respectfully requested.

Joffe et al. has been cited and its Fig. 4 and discussions relating thereto have been particularly cited as disclosing transmission of failed fax pages as recited in the claimed invention. However, this argument is respectfully disagreed therewith. In Joffe et al., a reverse connection is established for sending original email message and context information from the router to the mail server. Context information is also appended to the outbound email message 56 and the modified email message 52 is sent back from the mail server to the router. This process is repeated until the processing of the email message is completed successfully. [See Joffe et al. Col. 8, lines 66-67 and col. 9, lines 1-10]. In this manner, Joffe et al. avoids the need for secondary memory within the router, rather, the mail server is used for such storage.

Even in the event of a failed transmission, as shown in Fig. 4 and discussed relative therewith, in Joffe et al., the context information accompanies the email message. Context information is defined in Joffe et al., at col. 10, lines 44-67. However, no such context information is used or recited in the claimed invention, rather, "upon failure to successfully transmit all of the pages of the fax document ..."the fax pages of the fax document that failed to be successfully transmitted are transmitted in a secondary email message. A reverse connection is not necessarily established, as required in Joffe et al.


Application No. 09/474,935  
Amendment dated June 29, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of March 29, 2004

These and other reasons render the claimed invention patentable over Bloomfield in view of Joffe et al.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-18 is hereby respectfully requested. Applicants submit that the subject application is now in condition for allowance and an early notice thereof is respectfully requested. Should any further amendment be required prior to passing the application to issue, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
LAW OFFICES OF IMAM

Dated: June 29, 2004  
**LAW OFFICES OF IMAM**  
111 North Market Street, Suite 1010  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Tel: 408-271-8752

By   
Maryam Imam  
Reg. No. 38,190

Fax: 408-271-8886

I hereby certify that this correspondence with all attachments is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop No Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Arlington VA 22313-1450 on June 29, 2004 by Erika Villafana.

